

NORMS

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Norm 3 - The words actively “engage” connotates a vision of confrontation, battle. To keep the flavor of resolution and cooperation this effort is trying to capture, I suggest replacing “engage” with resolve or address or investigate or???
Agreed, the word “engage” can be perceived as an aggressive or hostile word. See the changes to Norm 3 which incorporate some of your suggestions. Also, we are currently working on a Dispute Resolution document to add some clarity, substance, and process to the Conflict Resolution norm.
2. “Balancing needs” takes a commitment to explain and justify those needs.
Good comment. We realize that “balancing the needs” is a very broad and general set of words. However, every time we tried to define all the things this encompassed, the wording and length became too much. For the sake of simplicity, it was crafted to be more of a philosophy rather than specific details. “Balancing the needs” may take on more specific, detailed meaning as we get further down the road and combine roles and responsibilities with outcomes and goals.
3. How will this be implemented at the working GS-12 and below level?
With respect to the Norms, all levels of the organizations will be responsible for implementing these 5 norms. If there are concerns that these norms are not being applied in any situation or at any level, we are currently working on a Conflict Resolution plan which will deal with these issues.
4. Norm #5 – Try “mutually agreeable” instead of “win-win”. People hate the “win-win” term.
This same concern was discussed back and forth at one of our meetings. Both terms worked, but “win-win” had a little more positive spin (overdone as it may be). This is a possible change that could be made to Norm #5.
5. Norm #3 – Should also be timely.
Agreed. See earlier response and changes below to Norm 3.
6. Mention respect as an overarching norm for I-V.
We understand the importance of this. We have added it under the Ethics Norm.
7. Communication: We need to be *accessible* when issues arise and *prompt* when responding to concerns or information requests.
Agreed, these are all issues we need to work on. Under the Ethics Norm, added words such as responsible, professional, and accountable hopefully address these concerns in day-to-day interactions. For communicating and addressing issues that

arise due to failure to apply the Norms or adhere to other guidelines, the Conflict Resolution plan is designed to address these concerns.

8. If we are to work as a team, then it's important not to get into the "blame game" especially at public forums like TMT.

Completely agree. The purpose of the Approach Norm was to point out this very issue of working as partners or as a team. If the "blame game" continues, then we are violating our Norms and need to take action.

OMISSIONS:

1. No reference to Treaty obligations.

Acknowledged. In developing the norms, we tried to provide broad, overarching approaches to our partnership. It was understood that more specific issues and details would be clarified in Roles and Responsibilities and Outcomes.

2. No reference to meeting Treaty obligations.

Acknowledged. In developing the Norms, we tried to provide broad, overarching philosophies and approaches to our partnership. It was understood that more specific issues and details would be clarified in Roles and Responsibilities and Outcomes.

3. Need one that says "No Surprises" when Corps and BPA are both in regional coordination meetings.

Good point. This issue came up in the discussions and formulation of the Norms, Philosophy and Policy Alignment, and Roles and Responsibilities documents. In terms of the Norms, probably the Ethics and Collaboration pieces best address the "No Surprises" issue. The thought being that the Ethics Norm states that we must be able to count on each other and the Collaboration Norm states that we work collaboratively. If these are followed, neither partner should be surprised at any meeting. Adhering to the Norms should eliminate at least the surprises associated with a lack of communication or coordination.

4. Who has the responsibility to point out when a norm hasn't been followed?

Since the Norms apply to everyone, then everyone is responsible for applying these norms in their day-to-day work. Therefore, it is the responsibility of everyone to try to clearly and professionally point out when a norm hasn't been followed to those involved. If you feel this approach has not worked, then the Resolution Process (currently being developed) will be the next step.

BARRIERS:

1. Understanding Columbia River Treaty calculations as relates to flood control. Such as AER elevations for Arrow versus real CRT elevations.

From the very start of this process, it was very clear that in order to achieve many of the outcomes we are hoping for from this partnership, there needs to be a better

understanding of our organizations, functions, roles, and areas of technical expertise. We are starting out slowly, but our intent is to provide more opportunities for learning between our two organizations. Broad overviews of organizations and functions can be done fairly quickly, but technical items, such as flood control and Columbia River Treaty requirements, will take a little longer. Our hope is to reach a state of understanding where technical or procedural issues are no longer barriers.

Proposed Revisions to the Norms:

Approach (no change): Be one team balancing the needs of both organizations.

Process (no change): Our decision-making must reflect the wide range of difficult responsibilities both organizations face.

Conflict Resolution: We have an obligation to actively *address and resolve* issues *in a timely manner*.

Ethics: *We are all responsible for bringing the highest level of professionalism, including respect, honesty, trust, courtesy, and accountability, to the partnership.*

Collaboration: We work together collaboratively – discussing issues *and opportunities, sharing data and study results, influencing each other to find mutually agreeable solutions.*